9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951)1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

Twa, as people living an active and dangerous life, and regarded as almost sub-human, had little to fear except being deprived of food by their master's whim.

All these dangers were real enough and no behaviour could ensure complete immunity. But most people appear to have felt that with some skill and right conduct they were avoidable and consequently did not constitute oppressive threats. Frustrations entailed by starvation and Tutsi requirements were regarded in pre-European days as part of an immutable natural and social order. Ruanda men and women were not inclined to speculate on the impossible, and any order of things other than that they knew belonged definitely for them to the sphere of the impossible. We shall see later on that a deep belief in the fundamental inequality of men had pervaded the ethos of the whole society, and had helped a great deal in the acceptance of frustrating conditions. Consequently these have not led to the usual feeling of aggressiveness or resentment.

Let us now turn to the invisible world as the Ruanda conceived it.[28] Although it was dominated by Imana, a god essentially powerful and good, it was a disquietening world. Indeed the spirits of the dead (*bazimu*), whatever their temper when they were in this world, were thought of as bad. The direct ascendants of the father's and mother's lines were usually protective if their living descendants had observed the proper filial behaviour, if they had not neglected prohibitions and avoidances, and if they had not forgotten offerings. But all other *bazimu* belonging to the same patrilineage were always harmful. *Bazimu* of other lineages were less dangerous unless there were feuds between the particular kin groups concerned. Among the spirits of the dead, a small clique, called the *imandwa*, was particularly powerful and might be helpful to those who had been initiated into the sect of Ryangombe, their chief.[29] Apart from these exceptions, ghosts were essentially malevolent towards living people. At best they did not harm. Of the two categories of men who had special relations with the invisible world, diviners and sorcerers, the latter were definitely considered to be criminals who either used poison (or other deadly substances as for instance when they mixed in food a powder made from the lungs of a person who had died from tuberculosis), or magical

[28] Maquet, 1958, pp. 526-30; Pauwels, 1958.
[29] See photographs in Maquet, 1957.

9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951) 1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

means (sending a *muzimu* to strangle somebody, acting through lightning or an animal, or using spells).[24]

What was the impact of this frightening world on the everyday life of Ruanda people? It seems that it was not ever-present in their daily lives. The Ruanda considered that most of the events in the human sphere as well as in the material world may be understood without reference to the action of the supernatural world. Some antecedent events or acts were considered as natural causes of the consequent ones. To get a cold at the beginning of the dry or rainy season was considered due to the change of weather. It was known that yaws could be got by contagion. Even death was very often interpreted without any magical explanation. It was expected for instance that people would die because of old age. When beans were sown on poor soil, a bad crop would not mean that the field had been bewitched. Thus when recurrences had been observed or when 'causes' had been discovered in the sphere of physical or human phenomena, events happening according to these recurrences or following their causes were considered as intelligible without any reference to the supernatural world. But when events appeared inexplicable in terms of these natural antecedents or causes, or were attended by some peculiar circumstances, intervention of spirits or sorcerers were suspected and a diviner was consulted. If somebody had tuberculosis and no one among his ascendants or the people with whom he lived had suffered from that disease, it was thought that the cause was a sorcerer. If somebody died from an illness usually considered 'natural', but his death occurred a few days after a theft of which he was the supposed culprit, he was said to have been magically striken at the request of the robbed person.

Even as regards his own death, the individual Ruanda seems to have taken a rather 'secular' view. All our informants agree that to die meant almost exclusively simply to quit life. They believed that they would become *bazimu*, but this left them rather indifferent. To abandon children, cows, fields, and friends was sad for people. But it was accepted without dramatization, as one of those facts which were in the normal order of things.

To sum up, freedom from want, frustrations, and objective fears was far from being achieved in Ruanda. Moreover, supernatural

[24] Cf. Czekanowski, 1917, pp. 302 f.; Arnoux, 1912-13; Pauwels, 1949b; Bourgeois, 1956.

9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951)1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

155
829

agents instead of being comforting were always potential enemies. There appear to have been certain defences, however. Firstly, there was a belief in the immutability of natural and social order; consequently this order and its frustrations were accepted as a matter of course. Secondly, there was always a means, whatever its efficacy, of coping with dangers and consequently people were able to hope that they would not be defenceless against them. We may thus conclude that social and natural conditions in Ruanda did not seem to prevent the bulk of people from enjoying the amount of psychological security necessary to go on living without tensions and anxieties such as disturb mental balance.

9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951) 1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

indices and the lynching of Negroes in the Southern States of the Union. There is evidently no rational means for the whites of the south to impute the responsibility for the lack of rain—which was then the cause of the poor cotton crops—to Negroes. This typically irrational behaviour, however, becomes comprehensible if we accept the frustration-aggression sequence. In this sense, it can be said that the relation between the two phenomena, economic crises and lynching, is a logical relation.[8]

Ruanda political relations disclose one of the premises of that culture. Underlying the political and feudal structures there was a general assumption about human relations. In order to formulate it as accurately as may be possible, I shall first consider more closely the social roles of the superior and inferior in the field of political and feudal relations. In the following section the words 'ruler' and 'subject' refer to superiors and inferiors in the administrative, military, and clientage structures.

2. THE RULER'S AND SUBJECT'S SOCIAL ROLES

The analysis of the political organization of Ruanda indicates that the ruler was expected to assume a complex role towards his subject. The two poles of it were protection and profit. The subordinate was somebody whom one protected; he was also a resource from which it was normal to draw some advantage.

Protection was not restricted to a certain field of action, but potentially encompassed the whole of the subject's life. When the inferior needed some help, any help, he was expected to apply to his ruler even if the issue was completely alien to the sphere of the main relations between the ruler and the subject. A client could ask his *shebuja* for aid in matters not pertaining to cattle and *buhake* services. It was even thought proper for the ruler to interfere in difficulties which his subject through his own misdemeanour had run into as, for instance, when an inferior had been caught stealing from somebody. When protection was refused, it was not because the question was not the ruler's concern, but on other grounds, such as disloyalty.

The extent of that protection was not strictly defined. It did not constitute for the ruler a set of particular and fixed obligations. The subordinate had a general right to be protected but very few claims to particular advantages. In *buhake*, when one offered one's

[8] Dollard, 1939, p. 44 (quoted by Maquet, 1951, p. 166).

9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951)1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

services to a lord in order to become his client, one was entitled to receive usufruct of his cattle. But the number of cows was not determined. It could be one or twenty or fifty or even more.

It was up to the ruler to decide if any protection was to be granted and to what extent. Of course the pressure of public opinion obliged him not to refuse aid to his subordinate unless he had some socially accepted reason to do so (such as the subordinate's disobedience), but the measure of the protection depended on his own will and pleasure.

These characteristics of the protective attitude (care of the whole of the subordinate's life, its very variable extent being left to the superior's judgement) allow us to apply to it the qualification of 'paternalistic'. Paternalism is understood here as 'the principle of acting in a way like that of a father towards his children. Because of the total dependency of the human offspring, during their first years, on those who nurse and educate them—and they are usually their parents—the latter's authority ranges over the whole of the life of the child. In everything he needs his parents, in everything they have to direct and control him. Moreover, parents sovereignly judge what they are going to give their children. Undoubtedly, their social groups force them to secure for their children the protection they need to live and develop but the children may not require such or such a particular service. Parents decide without further ado what is suitable for the child and think that better than he they know what is 'best for him'.

A paternal relation does not exclude profit. In describing the Ruanda's father's role towards his sons, I mentioned that the father's interests were usually thought to be predominant in respect of the children's interests. When inferiors were not the superior's children but his subjects or clients, that aspect of profit was much more emphasized. All those who occupied the inferior position in the relations of the political and feudal structures had dues to give and tribute labour to perform for the profit of their superiors, and some of these obligations were heavy. It did not appear at all unusual to Ruanda that power brought many privileges to those who had it. If one is a chief, is it not fitting to draw advantages from one's situation? Here, again, the extent of the subject's obligations was left within very broad limits to the superior's discretion.

The ruler's role seems to have been that paternalistic blend of

9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951) 1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

protection and profit. Of course, that role was not always perfectly fulfilled. Chiefs who have been more exploiters than protectors are remembered. It was by comparison with that ideal picture that their behaviour was judged and blamed.

The subject was expected to have a role complementary to the one we have just described. He was supposed to assume an attitude of dependency. Inferiority is the relative situation of a person who has to submit to another in a well delimited field. Dependence is inferiority in the whole of life. When the ruler gives an order, he has to be obeyed, not because his order falls within the field over which he has authority, but because he is a ruler.

It could be objected that in Ruanda this attitude of dependence was not in principle unlimited. We saw that cattle- and land-chiefs could not require as many dues as they liked, that subjects could resort to higher authorities against their immediate chiefs, and that it was possible to oppose one chief against another. This does not change the fact that the dependent attitude was the only one socially expected of the subject. Indeed it was impossible to be considered a 'good' subject if one asserted independence of one's superior. A claim of independence, even limited, obliged one to leave the superior, to ask for the support of another and to assume towards the latter an attitude of complete compliance. This appeared clearly in the feudal relation. A lord could not be refused what he asked (even at the present time a shop assistant who is obliged by the law to sell only for cash, will find it very difficult not to sell on credit to his lord). He could only be deserted for another.

3. FORMULATION OF THE INEQUALITY PREMISE

When paternalism and dependence define the permanent roles expected from two persons, much more is implied than when they express the transitory roles of a father and his young son. In the latter case it is known that the son will grow up and one day, even if he has to wait till after his father's death, will be equal to what his father was when the latter was young. But when paternalism and dependence are linked in permanent reciprocal roles, the assumption is that there is a fundamental inequality between the two persons. The subject will never grow up, he will never 'reach his majority'. It is implied without any doubt that there is between the ruler and his subject a difference so fundamental that it never can be suppressed. This fundamental inequality of men is the

9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951)1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

cultural premise underlying the social roles of the ruler and the subject.

We have seen that Ruanda society is made up of three hereditary groups with a very different participation in social power and that these differences were explained in terms of innate qualities. On the other hand, in a very great proportion of the political and feudal relations, the superior and the inferior belong to different castes. This indicates in what sense Ruanda feel men to be unequal.

This was not an inequality founded on differences in individual qualities or possessions. Of course, a very clever and artful man, a very wealthy possessor of great herds of cattle, could exert much greater influence, could have access to many more amenities of life and would command much more respect than a not very intelligent or a not very wealthy man. But these differences were not regarded as entailing such a significant inequality between them if they belonged to the same caste. Caste affiliation was mainly what made men unequal.

Several stories expressed the differences between the three castes and the qualities which were thought characteristic of them.[6] I mentioned above physical stereotypes. To them, moral qualities were added. Tutsi were said to be intelligent (in the sense of astute in political intrigues), capable of command, refined, courageous, and cruel; Hutu, hardworking, not very clever, extrovert, irascible, unmannerly, obedient, physically strong; Twa, gluttonous, loyal to their Tutsi masters, lazy, courageous when hunting, without any restraint. These stereotypes, admitted with only minor qualifications and slight differences and emphases by all Ruanda, Hutu and Twa as well as Tutsi, were thought to be essentially linked to caste affiliation. When asked if a Hutu brought up with Tutsi, and as a Tutsi boy, could not develop the Tutsi qualities, Hutu and Tutsi informants answer that such a training could change the boy to some extent, but not completely; the differences pertain to nature.

Caste status was, of course, not founded on a difference of qualities, objective or assumed, in the sense that if a particular Hutu was recognized as intelligent and courageous as a Tutsi, his status remained nevertheless unaffected. What mattered primarily indeed was not to have the qualifications of the upper caste, but to have been born in it. This was sufficient to determine a very

[6] Cf. for instance Sandrart, 1930, p. 139; Hurel, 1922.

9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951)1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

component in the content of a social intercourse, other components were regarded as less important and were coloured by the hierarchical situation of the two actors. In Euro-American culture, relationships of inferiority are defined not only as regards the people taking part in them but also as regards the matters concerned. A business executive may give orders to one of his employees only within very well-defined limits of competence and time, but he cannot oblige him to accept his views on for instance artistic or political questions. In Ruanda, on the contrary, when one of the persons involved in a dyad was superior to the other from a certain point of view, the superiority was diffused, as it were, through the whole relation. For his subject, a chief was always a chief in whatever matter.

This first theorem is a consequence of inequality conceived as essential. When two persons are considered unequal by nature, the superiority of one over the other cannot be limited to a certain sphere. Obedience in everything must be required: there is no field in which a father could be wrong and his son right.

Theorem Two

As in almost any human relation there is some superiority of one actor over the other, as that aspect is always stressed and as inferiority relations are patterned on inter-caste relations, paternalistic, and dependent attitudes were to be found in almost every human relation in Ruanda.

The only exceptions were relations between people who were equal from any point of view, as for instance young men of about the same age, belonging to the same caste and whose families were about at the same level of wealth.

This is very noticeable today, even in relations with Europeans. A clerk usually assumes towards the European he assists, a dependent attitude different from the behaviour of a European employee. The clerk expects from his employer a behaviour similar to the paternalistic attitude of the Ruanda superiors and he is puzzled and disappointed if the employer does not assume such an attitude.

Theorem Three

There is no private sector in the life of the inferior *vis-à-vis* his superior. The superior has the right to control the whole of his

9:Maquet E-5 (1949-1951)1961 FO42 Rundi FO42

inferior to the other to claim some particular fulfilment of the agreed promises from the other.

This appears clearly in the difficulties Ruanda often meet when they have to adjust themselves to European labour contracts. They are sometimes confused by the fact that the employer requires from them at the same time less and more than they expect. Less because the employer does not ask for more services, for longer office hours for instance, than what has been stipulated, and more because he is very exacting in the execution of what has been undertaken, for instance in matters of punctuality.

Theorem Five

With such socially accepted conceptions about inequality, those who occupy the superior positions in most of the social relations in which they are involved, tend to develop a permanent authoritarian behaviour. This is characterized by a propensity to command, to be self-assertive, arrogant, protective, and compassionate.

Chiefs, rulers, and other superiors try to extend not only the size or range of their power (the number of people controlled) but its density (the degree of control of the subordinates).[1] Any independence manifested by the inferior will be resented as rebellious.

This leads to intolerance. The superior's opinions should never be opposed by the inferior who is always and everywhere expected to manifest his dependence by attitudes of compliance. Even today this conduct tends to prevail. Some years ago a Ruanda deliberative assembly of people of standing was asked its opinion on a contemplated reform. After the most important person present there had given his opinion, everybody voted for his proposal. But after the meeting many expressed privately their divergent opinions. At the time of the vote, they had considered it improper and impolite not to agree with the superior.

Theorem Six

Even if the caste system and political and feudal institutions have succeeded to a large extent in moulding personalities in such a way as to make inferiors self-effacing, submissive, compliant, and dependent, the conditioning has not been perfect. Often the inferior wants to disagree with his superior's opinions, to avoid executing an order or obeying his commands. A straight refusal

[1] Cf. Russell, 1938, pp. 165 *f.*

91 Maquet E-5 (1949-1951) 1961 FO42 Rundl FO42

being regarded as insulting, disrespect or revolt, the only way out for the inferior is to appear to behave always as expected: to fall in with any desire of his superior while concealing his own opinion, never to say no to any order but to find clever excuses for not doing it. Consequently dissimulation is very highly thought of and a skill necessary to master for someone wanting to live more or less securely under such a political régime.

Many stories and proverbs give evidence of the frequency of covert disobedience to the rulers and of the appreciation in which an astute excuse and a 'good lie' were held. This was the only way to adapt oneself to such a situation.

Theorem Seven

It is commonly accepted in the Western tradition that truth has a high value and that language is the medium used to express 'truth', that is to say, 'what reality appears to be to the person who speaks'. Undoubtedly, in Western practice, language is used, even in the cognitive sphere, for many other purposes than to express what the speaker thinks. Moreover, most of the scholars who, in recent years, have studied the problem of the origin and function of language, bring qualifications to the traditional view. In the almost unanimous opinion of the carriers of Western culture, however, the ideal verbal behaviour must express 'truth' and not what is useful to the speaker. This is, for example, what is inculcated into children in schools.

In a society in which human relations are imbued with some cultural premises as the one being considered in this chapter, 'truth' cannot be recognized as a dominant value. Indeed, one is supposed to use language not to say what is thought to conform to reality but what is thought to conform to the ruler's opinion. Nobody, the ruler included, entertains many illusions on the sincerity of what is said, but submission has been expressed at the right time and this is felt to be most important.

This theorem could be formulated in this way: the verbal behaviour towards a superior must express dependence rather than 'truth'.

Theorem Eight

Once it is taken for granted that in hierarchical relations, behaviour must conform to the superior's expectations even to the

Ethel M. Albert

same caste. There are some short Tutsi and some tall Hutu. This makes no difference, for physical indices are not needed to distinguish Tutsi from Hutu. Recognition is based on their manner, their way of speaking, and their behaviour. Everybody agrees that the Tutsi and the Tutsikazi are born more intelligent—or, at least, cleverer—than the Hutu. This can be seen, it is said, because the Tutsi make the Hutu work for them without necessarily giving anything in return. There is general agreement that the Tutsi have a pronounced tendency to avarice and that old Tutsikazi are the worst misers in the world. Further, the Tutsi are most accomplished rhetoricians. The Hutu mutter and the Hutukazi lisp, and they are incapable of a good lie or of an elegant impromptu oration which seem second nature to Tutsi. Here, however, a contrast must be noted between Tutsi men and women: the boys are taught to speak well, the girls to be silent except to offer polite, evasive phrases.

It is believed that the Tutsi are physically and psychologically more delicate than the Hutu. They are not made, as the Hutu are, to work in the fields, to carry heavy burdens on their heads, to eat the solid, heavy food of the farmers. The Hutu pity the Tutsi when the latter are obliged by the government to do manual labour. True delicacy is shown by the *imfura*, literally the first born, more generally any person of very high birth, whose character and conduct constitute the model of nobility. The *imfura*, it is said, are so delicate that they take only liquid nourishment, especially milk and beer. All the Rundi know perfectly well that the Tutsi and their wives eat beef, cereals and vegetables. They are, however, so much taken by the myth of a liquid diet for superiors that even those who have been servants in the homes of Europeans—by definition, superiors—insist that the European diet is "liquid", that it does not give the strength needed for manual labour. Otherwise stated, persons of superior status do not work; their inferiors work for them. Elegance and dignity are joined together in everything that relates to the *imfura*. They wear beautiful clothing and much jewellery; they walk slowly and in front of others, or they are carried in a litter (although today the well-to-do prefer to travel by automobile); they speak softly, they never show their emotions; they are always discreet, they never discuss important matters in public. In fact, the dignity of well-born Tutsi and Tutsikazi seems sometimes to be primarily a frightening coldness and reserve. To respect the *imfura* and to fear them amounts to much the same thing.

It is necessary to stay in Burundi for a long time to see behind the stereotypes of the castes. In brief, it is assumed that the Tutsi

Towards her grand- Ethel M. Albert

603 554 children, a grandmother may at last dare to indulge openly in revealing her sentiments, without, however, neglecting practical considerations. Grandparents joke with their grandchildren, spoil them, protect them against their parents' anger, and, if they are [769] not believing Christians, they expect their grandchildren will in due course perform the ceremonies in honour of the *imizimu*, the spirits of dead grandparents.

• • •

577 829 The most direct route to happiness is conformity to the norms and rules of society. Most Rundi have some roles in which they are superior and others in which they are inferior and the accompanying obligations and compensations. A good wife of a generous and reasonable husband, a good mother of numerous and good children, a good mother-in-law of obedient and industrious daughters-in-law and of respectful sons-in-law, will be a happy woman. Unfortunately, it is necessary to take into account the ever-present and infamous "bad characters", the numberless misfortunes sent by *Imana* when he is in a bad humour, the truth that *Imana*—or, if one prefers, Nature, biology, or genetics—does not always pay attention to social norms. Thus, it can happen that a man is not qualified for the role of patriarch, that he suffers all his life the oppression of a nagging shrew. It can happen that a woman is born too weak for manual labour. If she does not find a kind husband who will carry the burden of the work of the household or a rich one who can provide her with workers, she will die very miserable and very young. It can also happen that a woman is more intelligent and more enterprising than her father, her husband, or her son. A woman of this kind is ordinarily encouraged to make use of her gifts—intelligence must not be wasted—but sometimes an energetic woman is tied to a husband who is cruel and stupid and can do nothing with her good-for-nothing sons. In the social life of Burundi, the motto is, everyone for himself. Each must do what he can with whatever *Imana* has given him.

There are many Rundikazi who are unfortunate and wretched— [562] orphans, the daughters of avaricious and cruel fathers, the wives of bad husbands, childless widows, the poor and the sick—in brief, those who do not have the favour of *Imana*. Let us pass in sad silence from their pathetic lot to the more fortunate women, those who have succeeded, despite the inevitable woes of life, in obtaining at least some measure of happiness, and to the true favourites 562 554 of *Imana*, the well-born women who are at maturity true matriarchs. The absolute quantity of power and wealth depends upon birth. A